



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

selected materials from official records, sacred and secular, put together, and perhaps added to, by seers and prophetic writers, of whom Jeremiah was the last; and, as he well may have been, one of the principal contributors. (6) That the Books of Chronicles were a compilation, possibly, nay, even probably, by Ezra, made largely from the Books of Kings, or from the documents on which these books were based, but with abundant references and allusions to nearly all the earlier historical books, including the Pentateuch. (7) That the Books of Ezra and Nehemiah were written by the writers whose names they bear, and contain, in part, extracts from official documents, and from contemporary records, and, in part, narratives of personal history. (8) That the prophetic writings are written by those whose names are, in every case, specified in their writings, and that they contain, in some instances, portions of contemporary history, but that the main element of their writings is distinctly predictive, and has reference to events that belong to what was future and posterior to the time when they were mentioned by the writer. (9) Lastly, that the historical books, as we now have them, bear plain and unmistakable marks of the work having passed through the hands, not only of the early compiler or compilers, but of later editors and revisers,—numerous notes, archaeological and explanatory, some obviously of an early, and some of a late date, being found in nearly all the books, but particularly the more ancient.

It is difficult to find a brief statement of the conservative position with regard to the Old Testament historical criticism, which arises from the fact that it is very difficult to make such a statement, and also because there are so many minor variations in opinion among conservatives. But the above formulation of this position by Dr. Ellicott will be found acceptable and useful in present discussion. It will be noticed what considerable changes have been wrought in the traditional view by the rectifying process which has been the result of current Biblical criticism. Such concessions by the most conservative are full of meaning, and suggest further modification to conform to the further findings of our progressive Christian scholars.

The Story of the Flood.* The Assyro-Babylonian account of the flood is in striking agreement with both versions of the Hebrew narrative. It resembles the Priestly account as regards the preparation and construction of the Ark, and the covenant sign of the rainbow; and the Jehovistic account as regards the seven days, the downpour of rain, the thrice-repeated sending of the birds, and the offering of the sacrifice. But there are points of difference equally striking, as regards the reason for the flood and the reason for its cessation, the Chaldean account being grossly polytheistic, while the Genesis narrative inculcates pure monotheism. The Assyro-Babylonian story was not borrowed from or expanded from the Hebrew story. Neither was the Hebrew story derived from the Assyro-Babylonians during the time of the Babylonian Captivity. They are independent traditions, derived from a primitive and pre-historic Semitic original, the ancestors of the Israelites having been of the same stock as were the founders of the great empires on the Euphrates. The differences in form between the two accounts reflect the influences of time and religious belief upon two nations working out their destinies separately. As to the historic character of the narrative, there has not been, since man appeared upon the earth, a universal and simultaneous inundation such as would cover the highest mountain peaks—it were a physical impossibility. The language used to describe the catastrophe is that of the ancient legend de-

* Article VII. of "The Early Narratives of Genesis," by Rev. Prof. H. E. Ryle, in *Expository Times*, July, 1892.

scribing a pre-historic event, and must be judged as such. The best solution of many obvious difficulties in the account is supplied by the recollection of the limited horizon which bounded the world of those ancestors of Israel—their world was the valley of the Euphrates and the Tigris, and their highest hills were the mountains round about it. The narrative of the flood therefore records to us some terrible but local cataclysm which overtook the original seat of the Semitic race, and there is no reason to call in questions the actuality of such an event. The ubiquity of the flood legend is not improbably due to the radiation of nations from a common geographical centre, and also to the fact that to the primitive races inundations were the commonest and most destructive visitation. The story is told in Genesis, not for the sake of the history, but for the sake of the religious instruction which could be based upon it, and that instruction is of an exalted and essential character.

An explanation of the Genesis account of the Flood, and one which, in the opinion of many, conserves all that is essential and of permanent value in that historic incident.

The Divinity of Christ in the Primitive Church.* If at the very beginning of its life the Church held Jesus Christ to be divine, and considered the doctrine of his divineness to be a part of the gift of truth it had received from God and accredited by its religious experience, the doctrine is presumptively true and an essential part of Christianity. The writings of the Apostles put the truths in which and by which the Church lived into simple form, adapted to immediate and spiritual need, and are adequate evidence of the contents of the religious consciousness of their writers and readers. They are unanimous in their conception of this doctrine of Christ's divinity. Paul makes Christ the central object of a true religious faith, into living union with whom all men might enter, and to have union with whom was to be united to God and to have holy character. He teaches that Christ was preëxistent, a divine being, who came as the founder of a new mankind, and receives the homage of the created universe, to which he does not belong (cf. 1 Cor. 8: 5f; Col. 2: 15f). He gives life; drawing men to himself, he transforms them by the union until at last all the race (substantially all, all but the refuse) share his life, his character, and his divine sonship. An examination of the other Epistles in the New Testament will show a harmony of belief upon this doctrine (cf. Rev. 5: 8-13; 1 Pet. 3: 14f; Jno. 1: 1-18, et al). The apostolic writings, then, show that the doctrine of the divinity of Christ was imbedded in the religious consciousness of the primitive Church.

This is the second of an exceedingly valuable series of articles on the history of the doctrine of the divinity of Christ. No more profitable study can be made than this, by those who are in doubt about Christ's divinity. The historical question is the prime one—did He claim to be so, and was his claim acknowledged and approved from the first? If so, what matters it whether philosophically or historically we do not like to admit it? It demands acceptance, and we must make room for it. We must be good historians, even if our speculations go by default.

The Apostolic Fathers and New Testament Revelation.† The attitude which the Apostolic Fathers, in the first centuries following the lives of Christ and the Twelve, took toward the claims of these Apostles to be special wit-

*Editorial in the *Andover Review*, June, 1892.

†By Prof. H. M. Scott, D. D., in the *Presbyterian and Reformed Review*, July 1892.